THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA

Writ Petition No.24103 of 1996

Dated: 05th July, 2006

Between:

Mohd. Ghouse

... Petitioner

and

1. The APSRTC, rep. by its Managing Director, Musheerabad, Hyderabad and another

... Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA

Writ Petition No.31146 of 1998

Oral Order:

Heard.

2. This Writ Petition is filed seeking to declare the action of the respondents for not declaring the result of the petitioner and not giving appointment to him as a Driver under Category A.1 since 1990 as illegal and arbitrary, and a consequent direction to the respondents to appoint him as he was selected and held medically fit, by giving seniority w.e.f. 1990.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that he was not considered for the post of Driver under Category A.1 by the respondent-Corporation.

4. From the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, it appears that the petitioner was sponsored by the Employment Exchange for the post of Driver and interviews were conducted in the month of October, 1989. It further appears that he was selected for the post of Driver, Category A.1. Subsequently, he was subjected to medical examination and he was found to be 'not fit' medically.

5. In fact, the medical authority, upon examination, issued a certificate, dated 30-08-1990, to the effect that the petitioner was unfit for A.1 Driver post since he was having a limp, which was a disqualification. However, upon the request

made by the petitioner, he was re-examined by the medical board and the same was rejected for the same reason as expressed by the medical authorities earlier. Subsequently, the petitioner submitted a letter, dated 14-03-1991, requesting the authorities to return the original certificates, which were submitted at the time of interview. Accordingly, all the certificates were handed over to the petitioner.

6. From the above facts, I see no valid reason to continue the writ petition.

7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

8. It is needless to state that the interim applications, if any, pending shall stand closed.

_____

D.S.R.VARMA, J

05th July, 2006.

Ak